

Claims 1-4, 8,11-16 and 18-21 are now pending and have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al., U.S. 4,755,421, in view of James et al., U.S. 5,674,591, Gordon et al., U.S. 5,763,332 and Pregozen, U.S. 5,141,803, for reasons of record. The remarks previously made in prior Office Actions in support of patentability apply equally and will not be reiterated for brevity. Additionally, the Examiner mischaracterized Applicant's argument that James et al. reference was nonanalogous art. Applicants' never suggested that James et al. was nonanalogous art but that the Examiner in determining obviousness must take the teachings of the prior art as a whole. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the amendments and remarks contained herein.

The Manning reference prepares the substrate by "conventional wet-laying techniques." (See column 5, line 30). The Manning reference fails to disclose a personal cleansing wipe with raised fibrous regions that have an average base weight ranging from about 40 to about 90 grams per square meter and a caliper ranging from about 0.3 to about 1.05 millimeters. The specific density is required of the present invention to allow the substrate to have the beneficial feel and effectiveness. There is no teaching or suggestion in Manning that the wipes contain raised fibrous regions. The present invention requires that the raised fibrous regions have an average base weight from 40 to about 90 grams per square meter and a caliper ranging from about 0.3 to about 1.05 millimeters. One of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine any reference with Manning to arrive at a wipe that contains raised fibrous regions that exhibit the average base weight and caliper range and is the personal cleansing wipe of the present invention.

The James reference is specifically directed toward the ability to place a textured design in a fabric. James does not suggest or teach the use of 100% to 400% of an aqueous liquid cleansing composition. Additionally, James does not suggest or teach the use of a textured fabric as a substrate that contains a cleansing composition that can be coated or impregnated into the substrate. Indeed, there is no disclosure in James regarding any prospective use of His substrate. Since there is no suggestion or motivation in James to place a cleansing composition with the substrate and Manning

provides no motivation to one skilled in the to add a cleansing composition to a substrate that contains raised fibrous regions, there is no motivation to combine these references.

Gordon discloses a substrate that is conventional tissue paper. (See column 21, line, 35-36). The Examiner cites Gordon for its teaching of a wet-like cleaning wipe and anionic detergent surfactants. The Gordon reference employs a process of papermaking that serves to impart a knuckle pattern of high density and low density zones in the resulting paper web that is unlike the present invention which has raised fibrous regions which have a density that is substantially the same density as the base surface. The present invention is directed to a non-embossed, non-woven substrate formed from hydroentangled fibers. Gordon does not teach or suggest the use of the present invention's substrate with regions at the base and raised fibrous regions which are the same and provides no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the wipe of Gordon combined with the prior discussed art to arrive at the present invention.

The wipe of Pergozen is processed into a uniform web by a carding machine. (See Column 6, lines 47-48). The process of manufacturing fiber arrangements using cards (large combs) involves using the cards to disengage the fibers from bales. The process results in very uniform air laid webs. Therefore, the web manufactured using a carding machine would not have the raised fibrous regions of the present invention. The Pergozen reference does not disclose any distinct substrate regions or patterns. Manning, James and Gordon all fail to specifically provide the content of the other elements of the cleansing composition. For this the Examiner cites Pergozen, which discloses an aqueous composition for impregnating a nonwoven wipe having a pH of from 3.5 to 4.5. The Pergozen reference relates specifically to the use of cationic biocides to preserve the integrity of wipes during storage to provide antibacterial properties to mostly hard surfaces. The Pergozen reference fails to disclose or suggest the addition of 1% to about 60% of a drying agent that provides for softer, smoother skin feel, with less stickiness or any distinct regions or patterns in the substrate. There is no teaching or suggestion that the additional elements disclosed in Pergozen be incorporated into a composition that is coated onto or impregnated into a non-embossed substrate. Therefore, without this suggestion one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the

components of Pergozen with the cited references to arrive at the present application.

Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 8, 11-16 and 18-21 are nonobvious over the prior art of record and any combination thereof.

Conclusion

In light of remarks and amendments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims 1-4, 8, 11-16 and 18-21 are allowable over the prior art of record or any combination thereof. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the noted claims, then the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John M. Howell
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,713
(513) 626-3792

February 6, 2003
Customer No. 27752

FAX RECEIVED
FEB 07 2003
GROUP 1700

FAX RECEIVED
FEB 07 2003
GROUP 1700